Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VIII, NO. 15, *Issue Number* 376, APRIL 11, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

APR 24 '51 MINNESOTA LIBRARY

WASHINGTON: A PSYCHOSIS

By Frank Chodorov

Psychology could do the country a valuable service by making a thorough-going analysis of the political mind. It should be done. Much of the confusion that bedevils the social body stems from the assumption that its frame of thought, its way of thinking, is identical with that of the political world, whereas even superficial observation shows that the political mind runs on tracks of its own. It is sui generis.

Just by way of analogy, and with no intent to be insidious, psychology recognizes the distinctive make-up of the criminal mind; it has complexes all its own, and criminal behavior is explained within the context of those complexes. In the same way, if the operations of the political mentality were clearly defined, the confusing incongruities of political behavior would fall into a meaningful pattern. It would be like opening the window of a room filled with foul air to be able to say: "What else can you expect from the political mind?"

The matter is of utmost importance at this time. Political thought is fast crowding out all other patterns, so that if it is not scientifically set apart it might cause a general mental unbalance. A community infested with gangsterism must take on the character of its dominant group, for, like Gresham's Law, decadent values tend to push out of circulation the values that call for integrity. So, as the area of private life is more and more constricted by political pressures, and we are compelled by necessity to adjust ourselves to the political mentality, it is entirely possible that its pattern may supercede what we still call common sense. Assuming that political psychology is essentially an aberration, it is not inconceivable that we may all go insane and not know it.

II

That the politician must have an indigenous mental arrangement follows from the fact that his way of getting on in life is different from that of any other human. The impact of one's livelihood on one's psyche cannot be discounted. The bellhop in Waterloo, Iowa, will make conversation as all bellhops do by remarking on the miserable weather;

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but, this one will add: "it's good for the crops". In Detroit, the impending strike is the obligato to all thought, and even the cigar store clerk in Wall Street is conscious of "Dow-Jones Averages". In Washington -- but we will leave that until we have explored the basic idea, that whatever circumstance determines our livelihood determines our thinking.

In that respect, the thief (used merely for illustrative purposes) is no different from any other human. The premises of his thinking may have been distorted by a phobia, but from there on his mind works as his business demands. He lives by breaking the law; his values are shaped accordingly. He cannot conceive, for instance, of a self-contained right of property. The idea is nonsensical, because experience tells him that the only inviolable property is that which cannot be got to.

To be sure, the criminal, because he has to live with himself, covers his business with an ethical cloak. He contends (like Karl Marx) that the robbery he is condemned for is common practice in all legitimate business; making a profit is only legalized thievery. Even in the matter of apprehension and punishment he finds comparison between his and legitimate business; in the latter, risks are covered by insurance, and he covers the risk of his trade by buying "protection" from complacent officials and by hiring devious legal talent. His thinking is shaped by his livelihood.

What we call the "normal" pattern of thought is so only because it is the pattern of the majority -- those who live by producing goods and services. Its "principles" are made necessary by the operation of the market place. The merchant, the doctor, the shoemaker all have a common objective, that of satisfying the need for their services, and all their thinking is shaped by the exigencies of trade. They fall in line with community customs because that way lies acceptance of their services. The fixation of acceptance is so strong in the market place psychology that when an individual breaks from it he is judged abnormal; he needs "adjustment". And the values that attain top-rating in the productive world -- honesty, dependability, thrift and so on -- got there only because without them this world would fall apart.

III

We come now to the politician. He is not a criminal, by definition. Nor is he a producer, even though the text books on political science go to great lengths to give him credit for aiding production; their insistence on this point is indirect admission of his incapacity to contribute a single economic "good" to the market place. So then, if he is neither a criminal nor a producer, his mental processes must be different from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

both and we must look to the manner of his living for a clue.

The politician lives by taxes. It is not that his personal emoluments are derived from levies on production, but that the entire world in which he moves and finds spiritual comfort is so supported. That is more important than his livelihood, which he could, in a pinch, dig out of the market place. But, were taxes miraculously to be abolished, the whole political world would collapse, taking his thought-pattern with it. He would most certainly suffer a mental unbalance.

Hence, taxation is of necessity a fixation in the political psyche. Yet, like all mental rigidities, it came by way of a rationalization. The institution of taxation rests foursquare on the axiom that somebody must rule somebody else. Were the notion to get around that people could manage without political power, it would be hard to make out a case for taxes. Therefore, uppermost in the thought-pattern of the political cosmos is the doctrine of power. The idea of letting people alone is as far from political thinking as letting property alone is from criminal thinking. (Isn't taxation also a denial of private property?)

Now, political power is nothing but the capacity to impose one will on another, so as to bring about behavior that would not otherwise occur. The consequence of exercising such power is to inflate the ego of the one in whom it is vested. The more power the politician wields the greater his self-esteem -- and the more readily does he justify a widening of his area of power and the consequential increase in taxes. The environment he lives in compels him to think that way.

Much of the criticism of the politician stems from a misconception of the nature of his business. The principles that obtain in the social world, the one built on production, cannot apply to a world that has no interest in production, except to tax it; that world must have its own rules. Politics is, in the best sense of the word, unprincipled; it is concerned only with rulership, and experience has shown that in that trade the only valid rule of thought and behavior is expediency.

That is the clue for the suggested psychological study. Of course, the scientist would hardly be satisfied with such generalities, but would dig for the taproots of political behavior in specific cases. He would then find that there are politicians and politicians. As an instance of the differentials in the political personality pattern, it might be mentioned that Senator Truman presents a case quite different from that of President Truman. For intensified investigation, our psychologist would do well to come to Washington.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There he will find a laboratory made to order: the inevitable cocktail party. This institution plays a far more important part in Washington life than mere sociability, for it is the hatchery of much that affects the business of the nation.

Let us suppose that at one party he meets, among others, the two principle types of politician, the bureaucrat and the Congressman. Present will surely be several newspapermen; they attend because they expect to pick up the thread to a headline, and they are invited because of their potential for publicity. The distaff side, being the bulk of the population, will be well represented. All present will show evidences of political-thought infection.

Though the conversation will be marked with trivialities, the investigator will quickly detect a tacit understanding; namely, that Washington is the cement that holds the country together. If our psychologist should suggest that perhaps the ordinary folk might rub along without Washington, that the legitimate functions of government could be conducted in a medium sized office building, he would freeze the assemblage into speechlessness. The mind channelled into the political pattern cannot comprehend a world without politics. The psychologist had better not advance the idea until the party is about to break up.

In the meantime, he might observe the marked difference between the demeanor of the Congressman and that of the bureaucrat. The latter will display a greater sense of self-assurance; he will be soft and sanguine; he will talk with an ex cathedra air that only a bureaucrat can affect. And that will be so even if his job is only to take charge of the inkwells on the fourth floor of the State Department. The Congressman, on the other hand, will be less sanguine but more assertive. He will display an urgency to convince and to please, characteristic of the market place psychology. He will show a sense of obligation and responsibility totally absent from the bureaucrat's psyche.

Perhaps the difference between the elected representative and the scion of the executive branch can be explained by the difference in tenure. The Congressman is rooted in his constituency, while the bureaucrat has only a bureaucrat to please.

One further hint and the psychologist must go it alone. He should not overlook the barber and the taxi driver. They, too, will reflect the political psychology, so all-pervasive in this voteless city that one suspects it is not so much a place as a psychosis.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 15

By Frank C. Hanighen April 11, 1951

APR 24 '51 ISRAEL

THE MACARTHUR STORY: Around the figure of MacArthur there whirls a thunderstorm compared with which all recent crises seem like squalls in a teacup. Great issues fraught with peril to this country, however they may be resolved, loom as a result of the startling recall of the Far East Commander.

It is to be hoped that the Executive and the Legislative body will deal with the resultant situation with an overriding sense of duty to the country's welfare. But, so far as the Executive is concerned, the signs are not propitious. For the inside story of how the President came to his epochal decision is so squalid a tale that even the most case-hardened reporter on a Tammany beat would shrink from relating all the details. But here is all that can be told so far.

Last Friday, the public may well have accepted MacArthur's remarks (read by GOP leader Martin of the House) with approving complacency, or a bored "that man is talking again". But that was not the reception in the White House.

Two weeks ago, when MacArthur sprang his cease-fire truce offer, the President was vexed, but mainly because Acheson was furious. This time it was the President who was furious, and his anger exceeded that of the Secretary of State.

Reason: the President took this MacArthur move as a direct political defiance and insult. In short, characteristic of the man, he took it on a partisan political basis. For the Commander's remarks were addressed to GOP leader Joe Martin, and read by the latter to the House. The MacArthur remarks to Martin did not appear to Truman in the shape of a reasoned plan for military strategy -- but as a plot by a Republican, boomed in 1948 for the Presidency, and relayed to a Republican leader who read them publicly for the purpose of putting the Democrats in the hole.

Some particulars of this Presidential posture are even less edifying. At the very first conference of top brass, to consider the MacArthur situation, the President wanted to fire MacArthur. (We learn this from eyewitness sources, which might not have understood everything, but did know what they saw.) At that meeting, according to our informants, Truman applied his favorite epithet, so much deplored by clergymen, to the Far East Commander and kept saying as he paced the floor: "The --- --- ---, he can't do that to me and get away with it."

And at that meeting, to the surprise of everyone, Secretary of Defense Marshall opposed the idea of the President. Marshall emphasized that recall might adversely affect the world military situation.

We do not profess to know what considerations prompted this Marshall stand (which apparently retarded for several days the final decision of Truman). But we may add the following towards solution of the mystery: word has just come to us from a high military officer that Eisenhower also opposed the recall of MacArthur.

In short, Truman dealt with this situation with scant regard for advice from his own military men, but with all the lusty animal instincts of a Kansas City ward heeler. No wonder Senator Jenner has asked for the impeachment of Truman.

* * * * *

THE ISSUE: Such is the color, the flesh, the blood, the smell of the Administration's new venture. What is quaintly called its "ideology" is something else. Not only the President's formal announcement of recall, but also the arguments advanced by his friends in the press -- "the Administration's psychological warfare against the American people", as one observer put it -- lays down the "party line".

Everyone on the Administration side says (but everyone knows it isn't so) that the real issue is civil power over the military. Well, it's a strange pass we've

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come to when a commander in the field cannot send a particular kind of military airplane on its appointed mission. Or to accept fresh troops from a friendly power which wants to help us. One wit put it, "Lincoln fired generals because they lost or wouldn't fight. Truman fires a general because he wants to win."

But the answer to the White House apologists is being put more trenchantly than that. Civil power over military? Well, the fact is, as anyone watching the scene knows well, that there is a complete vacuum in the White House and State Department in regard to the Far East situation. So, how can the civil power have precedence over the military when the civil power has abdicated in this situation? The question before the people is policy, not personalities; a plan, not the size of a Commander's hat. MacArthur has a policy, the Administration has none. MacArthur's plan may or may not be the right one. (Let's hear him tell it in detail.) But, meanwhile our army wallows in a stalemate; and our boys are being slaughtered week by week. Suddenly, their commander transgresses protocol in order to save them. He is fired. That's about all there is to it.

* * * * *

ON MCCARTHY AND OTHER MATTERS: Senator McCarthy is reported to be seeking permission to practice before the bar of the District of Columbia. The reason is that he would like to enjoy the opportunity of cross-examining Drew Pearson, the columnist. Pearson has filed suit against McCarthy, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and the Washington Times-Herald. When and if that suit comes to court, the Wisconsin Senator would like to act as his own counsel and thereby have the privilege of questioning the columnist on the witness stand. Their last meeting, it may be recalled, was fistic.

---- There are persistent reports that a controversial figure who appeared before the Tydings Committee a year ago will be called before the Internal Security Committee of the Senate, headed by Sen. McCarran, when that body gets under way. According to some reports, the Committee will produce evidence as persuasive as that developed by the House Un-American Activities Committee against Alger Hiss in 1948.

---- It has almost escaped notice that the name of Edgar Snow has disappeared from the list of editors of the Saturday Evening Post, since the first of March. No explanation has been given by the Post. It is recalled that Plain Talk, in 1947 published a detailed article by Freda Utley criticizing Snow for his friendly articles about the Chinese Communists.

* * * * *

REVOLT IN THE JUDICIARY: White House circles fear that the bench will take courage from Judge Bennett Clark's stand of last week and that, to the rebellion in the legislative arm of the Government, will be added revolt in the judiciary.

It took some courage, in these weak-kneed days, to say last Friday, "He [President Truman] has no more standing in this court than any other citizen. He has no right to influence litigation." These were the words of Judge Clark of the Court of Appeals in the argument over the case of the American President Steamship Line, when Clark heard that President Truman had directed the filing of a suit in connection with this case. Clark's forthright statement came as he and other members of the Appeals body cited for contempt of court Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, Solicitor General Perlman and various others, including Mr. George L. Killion, President of the Government-controlled American President Lines and former Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee.

The Appeals Court said Messrs. Sawyer, Killion et al had failed to carry out the Court's order to return the shipping line to its former owner, the Dollar Line. Judge Clark, remarking on the Government's control of the American President Lines, cut the whole affair down to size, when he said, "The whole thing has resulted in George Killion keeping a very lucrative job."

Underlining his independent spirit in the contempt citation, Judge Clark mentioned that he took his stand despite the fact that he is "an old friend" of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President. (Clark certainly is, or was, for in 1946 President Truman served as best man at the wedding of Clark and actress Violet Heming.)

Judge Clark's stand deserves attention and praise for his assertion of the independence of the judiciary, in these days when many have written off the separation of powers and when the political activities of Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter are taken as a matter of course; and Clark's remarks on Killion put the case in proper constitutional perspective -- a much-needed antidote to the trend toward government-by-influence and government-by-crony.

* * * * *

KAUFMAN: Another judicial utterance of the last week further strengthens hope in the ultimate soundness of our judiciary. We refer to Judge Irving Kaufman's statement in sentencing the defendants in the atom bomb spy case. (Contrary to much general misunderstanding, this Judge is not the one who presided at the first Hiss trial. The latter was Judge Samuel H. Kaufman.)

Judge Irving Kaufman -- we learn from private sources -- gave his historic statement deep and prayerful study, before writing it. His was the solemn responsibility to decide whether or not he should impose the death sentence for espionage. Historians say that the death sentence for espionage has never before in our history been carried out in any major civil case.

We learn that Judge Kaufman, with this awesome responsibility on his mind and soul, consulted his rabbi and spent many hours in prayer and meditation, before coming to the conclusion that he should sentence Julius and Ethel Rosenberg to death for stealing atom bomb secrets for Soviet Russia. His statement was clothed in righteous angry words: "Your crime is worse than murder . . . who knows but that millions more may pay the price of your treason . . . we have evidence of your treachery all around us every day, etc. etc." We venture the guess that, had it not been for the uproar over the Crime Committee Hearings in New York, which were held the same day, Judge Kaufman's name would be linked in country-wide approval with that of Judge Medina.

The spectacle of these two American citizens sentenced to death for treasonable activities lights up one of the more murky aspects of our American scene today. The picture, indeed, recalls one evoked by Goethe in his letter to Lavater, June 22, 1781: "Believe me, our moral and political world, as a great metropolis used to be, is undermined by subterranean corridors, cellars and cloacae; the relationship and considerations of which are quite unknown to the inhabitants above, indeed mean nothing to them. Now, anyone who knows a little about these matters becomes far more knowledgeable when an earthquake destroys the surface, thus allowing vapors to escape from this pipe and mysterious voices from that unsuspected conduit."

* * * * *

SLIDING SUPPORT: Up to midnight of last Friday (April 6), holders of Treasury 2 1/2 per cent bonds maturing 1967-72 could exchange them for the new non-marketable 2 3/4's. Just before this expiration time, the 2 1/2's were supported by the Federal Reserve Board at 99 2/32. On Monday of this week they closed at 98 30/32 bid; this was the lowest level reached by these bonds since issuance in 1945. Our Wall Street informant advises that the bidder at this low level is the Federal Reserve Board. The same source provides us with a Wall Street conjecture as to the meaning for this gradual lowering of the peg-price.

Obviously, bonds which yield 2 1/2 per cent must drop in value when bonds with the same security (the United States Government) yield 2 3/4. The market value of any security is the capitalization of its yield. It was to be expected that when the Government put out the better-paying bonds those in existence would drop in value. But, how much? They would drop, most certainly, to a price where the yield would be equal to that of the 2 3/4's. In addition, since support is a factor, the drop would be further determined by the figure at which the FRB would continue to peg -- and no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statement on that point has been made. The FRB has apparently followed a policy of coming to the support of the bonds when in its opinion it is falling too dangerously.

Just what the danger point is nobody knows; therefore, everybody guesses. The most plausible guess is this: That the FRB is permitting the bonds to drop gradually so that the banks, particularly the smaller banks, can gradually bail out. Many of these banks show a capital structure well loaded with Governments; in some cases as much as 70 per cent of all they own are these securities. Conservative banking considers that unhealthy. So, the argument goes, the FRB is anxious to let these banks get out from under. As the bonds drop in market value their yield increases; 2 1/2 per cent of 98 is more than 2 1/2 per cent of 100. This higher yield is particularly attractive to large investors -- trust funds, institutions, etc. It is hoped that these buyers will be won over by the yield of the Governments at the lower level, and that they will shift to them from whatever industrial securities they hold.

If, however, the support is withdrawn too fast, Wall Street says, the bonds would drop to the point where the banks would be in bad shape; some say the "real" price of these bonds, in an unsupported market, would be about 92. Since the banks own most of the bonds at around 100, such a drop would represent a loss of a good part of their capital. The FRB could hardly be a party to such a condition. Besides, a precipitate drop in the bonds would defeat the main purpose -- to let the banks bail out; for buyers would hesitate until they were sure the lowest possible figure had been reached.

Hence, the conjecture is, the FRB is letting the bonds drop gradually.

* * * * *

REVISIONISM: Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes has gotten out another pamphlet re-examining the causes of the last war, entitled "Was Roosevelt Pushed Into War By Popular Demand In 1941?" (Distributed by Henry Regnery Company, 20 W. Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.) The publication is a reproduction of Dr. Barnes' remarks at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, December, 1950. In taking exception to the claim, by another historian present, that the nomination of Wendell Willkie by the Republicans in June 1940 was in response to an "insistent demand" of the rank and file, Dr. Barnes said:

"It is doubtful if any man was ever nominated for the Presidency on the basis of less popular knowledge and approval. There were at least a dozen or more persons in the famous 'smoke-filled room' in the Chicago hotel where Warren G. Harding was chosen for the nomination in 1920. Two men decided that Mr. Willkie should be the Republican nominee. . . . These men were Ogden Mills Reid, publisher of the New York Herald Tribune, and Thomas W. Lamont, Chairman of the Board of J. P. Morgan and Co."

Then Barnes goes on to relate an anecdote which concerns Senator Taft. The story, to our knowledge, is well confirmed, but has enjoyed little publicity. "Some time before the Convention," goes on Barnes, "Mr. and Mrs. Willkie and Senator and Mrs. Robert A. Taft were invited to a dinner party at the home of Mr. Reid. No suggestion had been made to Senator Taft, at least that this was more than a social gathering. He was surprised to find Mr. Willkie present. After dinner, Reid and Lamont put Mr. Willkie and Senator Taft through an inquisition as to their views on aiding the allies, especially England. Mr. Willkie expressed full agreement with the Roosevelt policy, but Senator Taft remained firm in his anti-interventionist stand. This he did, even though it had become apparent to him that he and Mr. Willkie were being decisively appraised as to their qualifications for the Republican nomination. From this time onward, Reid and Lamont worked vigorously for the Willkie nomination."

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective. Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

1710 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED